

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION

Civil Action No. 5:09-cv-00449

R. DANIEL BRADY ET AL.,	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
XE SERVICES LLC ET AL.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)
_____	)

**DEFENDANT JEREMY P. RIDGEWAY’S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’  
SEPARATED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO CONDUCT JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY**

COMES NOW Defendant Jeremy P. Ridgeway (“Mr. Ridgeway”), by counsel, pursuant to Local Rule 7.1, and hereby submits this Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Separated Motion for Leave to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery (the “Opposition”). Plaintiffs’ Separated Motion for Leave to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery (the “Motion”) should be denied because Plaintiffs have not established the requisite prima facie evidence of personal jurisdiction that is needed for the Court to grant Plaintiffs leave to conduct the discovery in question. The grounds for this Opposition are set forth more fully in the accompanying Memorandum in Support.

WHEREFORE, Mr. Ridgeway requests respectfully that the Court deny Plaintiffs' Motion.

Respectfully submitted this the 17th day of February, 2010.

By: /s/ Edward H. Maginnis

Edward H. Maginnis (Bar No. 39317)

**MAGINNIS LAW, PLLC**

6030 Creedmoor Road, Suite 200

Raleigh, NC 27612

Telephone: 919.526.0450

Facsimile: 919.882.8763

emaginnis@maginnislaw.com

*Counsel for defendant Jeremy P. Ridgeway*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on February 17, 2010, I caused true and correct copies of the foregoing Opposition to Plaintiffs' Separated Motion for Leave to Conduct Jurisdictional Discovery to be served on counsel registered with the CM/ECF system.

/s/ Edward H. Maginnis  
Edward H. Maginnis